

Remarks

Claims 5-8 have been amended. Claims 1-8 remain in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims as now presented is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 5 has been amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. As such, the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng-Pei (U.S. 5,029,629). The Cheng-Pei '629 patent is generally directed to a curtain lift controller incorporating a brake mechanism. The Cheng-Pei '629 patent, however, fails to teach or suggest the novel aspects of the invention contained in the presently pending claims.

Amended Claim 6 now recites a releasable lock mechanism that releasably retains the sprocket support in a first rotational orientation with respect to the chain guard housing. As described at, for example, page 3 line 30-page 4 line 14; page 7 line 28-page 8 line 25; and page 19 lines 10-18 of the application as originally filed, it

is desired to provide a mechanism which operably aligns the sprocket support and the chain guard housing in a pre-defined relative orientation for, e.g. installation operations. The releasable lock mechanism of the present invention enables such alignment, while further enabling the selective rotation of the chain guard housing with respect to the sprocket support. Such selective relative rotation facilitates the installation of the chain onto the sprocket wheel without having to dismantle the control unit, and minimizes wear and damage to the unit caused by rough handling of the chain about the sprocket wheel. The claimed releasable lock mechanism therefore enables both a predetermined fixed relative orientation between the sprocket support and the chain guard housing, as well as the selective rotational movement therebetween. Nowhere does Cheng-Pei '629 teach or suggest such a releasable lock mechanism now recited in amended Claim 6.

Claim 7 as presently amended recites one or more lugs extending from the chain guard housing in a perpendicular orientation with respect to the front face of the control unit, and away from the splined bush. In such a manner, the one or more lugs are oriented to operably engage with a control unit mounting bracket that secures the control unit to the window frame. As described at, for example, page 4

line 26-page 5 line 6; page 8 line 27-page 9 line 16; and page 18 line 29-page 19 line 8 of the application as originally filed, the claimed specific orientation of the one or more lugs enables accurate alignment of the control unit relative to the mounting bracket so as to ensure that the opening of the chain guard housing is disposed in a downward-facing direction, and so as to minimize wear and damage to the control unit during operation. Moreover, the one or more lugs in operable engagement with the control unit mounting bracket limits the rotational freedom of the control unit to thereby eliminate undesired "tapping" noises during operation. The one or more lug orientation now claimed is further illustrated in Figures 3, 4, 7, and 8 of the application as originally filed. No such lugs are disclosed or suggested in Cheng-Pei '629.

Claim 8 has been amended to more specifically recite that the axial cross-section of the wrap spring juts are non-circular, while the axial cross-section of the body portion of the wrap spring is circular. In other words, an end view of the spring material itself at the wrap spring juts reveals a non-circular cross-section, while an axial cross-section of the wrap spring material at the body portion of the wrap spring is circular. Nowhere does Cheng-Pei '629 teach or suggest such axial cross-sectional

configurations now recited in amended Claim 8. In view of the foregoing, the claim rejections based upon Cheng-Pei '629 should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims as now amended are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. Applicant therefore submits that the claims as now presented are allowable on the merits. An early allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HAUGEN LAW FIRM PLLP



Mark J. Burns, Reg. #46591  
Attorney for Applicant  
1130 TCF Tower  
121 South Eighth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone: (612) 339-8300